INDEX

Of

"ITNESSES

Prosecution	's Witr	nesses	Page
Ballantine	e, Jose	ph W. (resumed)	10986
,,	" Mr.	Blakeney (continued) Blewett Cunningham Warren Smith	10986 10994 11017 11035 11052

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

3	Doc.	Pros.	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
	93		1247	Answer handed to Mr. Grew in Tokyo and by him forwarded to the Department of State (From Report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack - Congress of the United States) (pp.441-442)	10987	10987
	94		1248	Mr. AMAU's Book	11060	

1	
2	Thursday, 21 November, 1946
3	
4	
5	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST
	Court House of the Tribunal
6	War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan
7	
8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
9	The Tribunal med, pursuant do day
10	at 0930.
11	
12	Appearances:
13	For the Tribunal, same as before with the
14	exception of the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from
15	India, not sitting.
16	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
17	For the Defense Section, same as before.
18	The Accused:
19	All present except OKAWA, Shumei, who is
20	represented by his counsel.
21	
22	(English to Japanese and Japanese
23	to English interpretation was made by the
24	Language Section, IMTFE.)
25	

G LARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International re Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. 1 n THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. b 0 4 JOSEPH W. BALLANTINE, called as a 80 witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed B the stand and testified as follows: a 7 CROSS-EXALINATION S BY MI. BLAKEFEY (Continued): 9 Q We were discussing at yesterday's adjourn-10 ment the delivery of the final Japanese note on the 11 7th of December. I have just one more question on 12 that, and that is this: You remember that Ambassador 13 NOMURA originally made his appointment for one 14 o'clock specifically to call on Secretary Hull at 15 the Department of State. 16 A That's correct. 17 4 and, upon arriving at a later hour, made 18 explanation that he had been delayed for certain reasons. A That is correct. Q Now, in regard to the message of President 23 Poosevelt to the Emperor, what answer was received 24 to that? A I'm not very clear about that other than

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what Mr. Grew may have received in Tokyo. Q I should like to hand you a document and ask you whether you can identify it as the answer handed to Mr. Grew in Tokyo and by him forwarded to the Pepartment of State (handing document to witness). I should have said this was defense document No. 93. A Yes, I have seen this document before. I have seen this message before. IR. BLAKENTY: I now offer for identification defense document No. 93. CLEAK OF THE COU.T: Defense document No. 93 will be given exhibit No. 1247 for identification only. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked deferse's exhibit No. 1247 for identification.)

MR. BLAKENEY: Exhibit No. 1247, constituting an excerpt from the report of the Joint Committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack, is offered in evidence.

> THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. (Whereuron, defense's exhibit No.

1247 was received in evidence.)

Mr. BLAKEMIY: I do not propose to read it into the record unless the Tribunal so desires.

THE PRESIDENT: Read it, please.

MR. BLANINEY: May I inquire whether the Language Section is prepared to make a simultaneous translation?

THE MONITOR: Yes, we are, sir.

MR. BLAKENEY: (Reading)

"At 7 a.m., December 8 (Japan time) Ambassador Grew was awakened by a telephone call from an official of the Japanese Foreign Office who requested him to call on Foreign Minister TCGO as soon as possible (ex. 30 p. 493). "Then Ambassador Grew arrived, Foreign Minister TCGO, "grim and formal," hended him the Jananese Government's memorandum breaking off the negotiations. The Foreign Minister said that he had been in touch with Emperor Minister said that he had been in touch with Emperor Minister said that he had been in touch with Emperor Minister said that he had been in touch with Emperor Minister said that he had been in touch with Emperor Minister said that he had been in touch with Emperor Minister said that the memorandum be regarded as his reply to President Moosevelt's message. Ambassador Grew reported to the State Department that the Foreign Minister thereupon made to him the following oral statement:

"! Wis Majesty has expressed his gratefulness and appreciation for the cordial message of the President. He has graciously let known his wishes to the Foreign Minister to convey the following to the President as a reply to the President as a reply to the President as a reply to the letter's message.

""Some days ago, the President made incuiries regarding the circumstances of the augmentation
of Japanese forces in Prench Indo-China to which
His Pajesty has directed the Covernment to reply. "ithdrawal of Japanese forces from French
Indo-China constitutes one of the subject metters of the Japanese-American negotiations.
His Pajesty has commanded the Covernment to
state its views to the American Government
also on this question. It is, therefore, desired that the President will kindly refer to
this reply.

""Establishment of peace in the Pacific, and consequently of the world, has been the charished desire of Fis Majesty for the mealization of which he has hitherto made his Covernment to continue its earnest endeavors. His Majesty trusts that the President is fully aware of this fact." (ex. 178)"

8

10

11

12

13

14

17

13

19

20

21

22

25.

24

25

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Consider the Now, lastly, Mr. Witness, I want to ask you one or two questions about the modus vivendi proposal. Is it correct that the United States draft modus vivendi proposal prepared in the days prior to the 26th of November included provision for supply of some petroleum to Japan?

A That is correct, a small quantity for civilian uses.

That small quantity for civilian uses, was it not a far more limited provision than the equivalent provision contained in the Japanese modus vivendi proposal of the 20th of November?

A It is very small, indeed, compared to what the Japanese included in one of their intercepts they were going to ask for.

Q Was this petroleum question one of the vital differences between the two nations at that time?

A I don't know exactly what you mean.

Q I mean, was it one of the problems which seemed most difficult of solution?

A Well, the Japanese Government had asked in their proposal of November 20 for such petroleum as Japan might require. That presented great difficulties for us.

on this petroleum question at all likely.

A When Japan moved into southern Indo-China
in a position to attack us, we couldn't see our way

clear to give Japan petroleum for that purpose.

Q If the petroleum question was one on which the parties were so far from agreement, did the State Department believe that there was any real prospect of an agreement on the modus vivendi at all?

A We thought there was very little prospect of any acceptance by Japan of the modus vivendi that had been drafted.

Q Do you remember Secretary Hull saying something about their being one chance in three that it would be acceptable?

A He said, I believe, "not more than one chance in three."

Yes, I believe that's correct. Nevertheless, Secretary Hull did urge it upon the Chinese Ambassador on the 25th of November, did he not, saying that "we have been carrying on conversations and making some progress so far"?

A Yes, he proposed it to the Chinese Ambassador.

Q So that the Department felt, did it not, that there was some reasonable prospect that the presentation of the modus vivendi would result in the achieve-

3

1

2

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

ment of further progress?

A He didn't think there was a reasonable prospect. He thought there might be a very slight prospect of the thing -- the proposal was a worth-while proposal, but he didn't think there was very much chance of the Japanese accepting it. The Japanese had given a very clear indication in their intercepts that that November 20 was their minimum proposal, and what we were offering was chicken feed compared with what they were asking.

Q You already said, I believe, that modus vivendi as never presented.

A I don't remember whether I said it or not, but that is a fact.

Q Would it be correct to say that it was not presented finally because of the opposition of the Chinese as expressed by the Chinese Ambassador?

A That was one important factor in the situation. There were other factors.

Q At this time, however, the position of the Department of State was, was it not, that it was not acting for the other interested nations?

A The proposed <u>modus vivendi</u> -- our proposed <u>modus vivendi</u> called for certain steps in cooperation by these other countries. It could not have been

carried out by the United States alone.

Q The <u>modus vivendi</u> draft was thought of, was it not, in the Department of State, as being merely a continuation of the previous conversations?

A The <u>modus vivendi</u> was a part of the whole proposal. The communication of November 26 -- the whole communication was a part of that, too, of which the <u>modus vivendi</u> was to be just one part. What we envisaged was that during the life of the <u>modus</u> vivendi we would carry on conversations toward the objectives of a permanent peaceful agreement.

Q And those conversations would have been a continuation of the conversations which had been in progress, would they?

A That is correct.

IR. BLAKENEY: That is all. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Pr. Blowett.

13. BLEWETT: If the Court please, I shall restrict my inquiry to matters not heretofore covered wherever possible.

THE PLESIDENT: We expected that.

23

4

5

6

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MIN. BLEWETT:

Q Mr. Ballantine, what do you mean by the phrase "Japan attacked against us" as far as the region of Indo-China is concerned?

A Could you tell me where that passage is, please?

Q Just a moment ago, sir, in answer to a question by the examiner with reference to petroleum you used those words.

A In southern Indo-China, Japan placed herself in a position where she stood over the Philippine Islands, was able to have threatened vital trade routes affecting our trade with the Far Last, and she was also in a position to threaten the territories of our friends who were resisting aggression.

Q Then you had in mind, in part at least, our business interests.

A Our business interests were a very small part of the consideration. The main part was, the Far Hastern region is a region of great production of strategic commodities such as tin and rubber which we used in great quantities.

Q You referred to 1905 with regard to Japanese investment in Manchuria. Did not Japan invest in and

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MIL BLEWETT:

Q Mr. Ballantine, what do you mean by the phrase "Japan attacked against us" as far as the region of Indo-China is concerned?

A Could you tell me where that passage is, please?

Q Just a moment ago, sir, in answer to a question by the examiner with reference to petroleum you used those words.

A In southern Indo-China, Japan placed herself in a position where she stood over the Philippine Islands, was able to have threatened vital trade routes affecting our trade with the Far East, and she was also in a position to threaten the territories of our friends who were resisting aggression.

Q Then you had in mind, in part at least, our business interests.

A Our business interests were a very small part of the consideration. The main part was, the Far Bastern region is a region of great production of strategic commodities such as tin and rubber which we used in great quantities.

Q You referred to 1905 with regard to Japanese investment in Manchuria. Did not Japan invest in and

develor Manchuria at that time under a recognized treaty agreement?

A Would you tell me where that passage is, please?

(There is just a reference to it on the first page near the bottom.

A I fail to find that reference. I said, "In 1905 Japan established herself a curely in Manchuria by acquiring a lease to the Kwantung territory and ownership of the South Manchuria Railway."

Q Well, doesn't that mean that they entered into a treaty or agreement legally?

A Yes.

Q Now, is it not a fact that in the early stages of the negotiations the attitude of the United States with regard to the withdrawal of troops in China was quite reasonable which later became limited?

THE PRESIDENT: Surgest to him, Mr. Blewett, why it was reasonable in the first place and why it became limited later, if you can. Maybe he has told us all he knews about that, and we do not want those things repeated.

MR. BLEVETT: I expect to follow that, if your Honor please, with regard to developments along about that time, in '41.

6

4

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

M
0
r
S
9
ŝ.
Ä
b
r
a
m

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

1.9

10

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. BLEWETT (Continued):

- Q Did the United States continue to aid China under lend-lease or other legislation during the pendency of the negotiations?
- A You mean during the period of the conversations:
 - Q Yes, sir.
 - A That is correct.
- Q Now, prior to June 22, 1941, the United States agreed ith Janen as far as suggestions for the retention of troops agains communistic activity as is evidenced by the draft.
 - A That is not correct.
- go back to that if you say it is incorrect. I was under the impression that according to the drafts and according to your testimony that prior to June 22 the United States did have some understanding with regard to the retention of troops so far as communistic activities were concerned.

A You will note that in exhibit 3 of my affidevit, page 4, Roman numeral III, Trabic numeral 2, we have in parenthesis "connerative defense against injurious communistic activities, including stationing of Japanese troops in Chinese territory" close

0	
r	
S	
e	
ŝ.	
A	
b	
n	

9

10

11

12

15

141

15

16

17

10

20

21

22

23

24

BY MR. BLIWETT (Continued):

- Q Did the United States continue to εid Chins under lend-lesse or other legislation during the pendency of the negotiations?
- A You mean during the period of the conversetions:
 - Q Yes, sir.
 - A That is correct.
- Q Now, prior to June 22, 1941, the United States agreed ith Janan as far as suggestions for the retention of troops agains communistic activity as is evidenced by the draft.
 - A That is not correct.
- go back to that if you say it is incorrect. I was under the impression that according to the drafts and according to your testimony that prior to June 22 the United States did have some understanding with regard to the retention of troops so far as communistic activities were concerned.
- A You will note that in exhibit 3 of my affidavit, page 4, Roman numeral III, Arabic numeral 2, we have in parenthesis "connerative defense against injurious communistic activities, including stationing of Japanese troops in Chinese territory" close

parenthesis, "Subject to further discussion." 2 Well, that implies, of course, that there was some discussion regarding that proposition. 4 A We have been having discussions -- we had 5 been having discussions on that question from the very 6 beginning clmost to the end. 7 Q Was there or not any change in the attitude of the State Department subsequent to Germany's attack 9 on Rissia? 10 A Our attitude on that question was the same from 11 the beginning to the end. 12 Did you or enyone in the State Department 15 have any notice of the imminence of Germany's attack 14 on Russia prior to June 21, 1941? 15 A Yes; cortainly. That is a matter of public 16 record, that the Acting Secretary of State informed 17 the Russian Government that we had intimation that 13 Germany was going to attack Russia. 19 Q Did that fact have any bearing or influence 20 on the question of the removal of troops from China 21 so far as the draft of June 21 was concerned? 22 A That never entered our minds at all. 23 Q as the draft of June 21 considered in any

way in line with the supposition that the attempted

German landing in England was not a near prospect?

A I didn't quite clearly understand your question.

Q Was the question of whether or not an attempted landing of Germany on English soil considered in any way in the negotiations or in the drawing up of the draft of June 21?

A It certainly was not in my mind and I heard no reference to it from anybody also.

Q mas there, at any time, any serious consideration by the State Department relative to the recognition of Manchukuo?

A Our position right along was that that was a question between China and Japan. If China were voluntarily, through amicable negotiations, willing to agree to it we had nothing to say. Our position is clearly stated in the June 21 draft: Amicable negotiations in regard to Manchukuo.

Q Then your Department would not have objected to it?

A As far as I know. If there had been perceful negotiations, without duress, and China had been willing to agree to it, I don't think that enybody would have had anything to say. That is just my personal feeling. That is the clear implication of this draft.

Q Am I correct or not, then, in assuming that

there was a change of attitude in so for as the November
2 26 draft was concerned, inasmuch as it insisted that
3 all negotiations must be made with Chungking?

A We consistently took the position that the National Government of China, with temporary capital at Chungking, was the government which we recognized and that was the government of China. We never changed in that position.

Q Did not the economic plan of Japan concerning China, Japan and Manchukuo, conform to the tendercy among nations at that time?

A Conform to the tendency of the Axis Powers, a tendency which we were doing our best to change.

Q Were there not other trade blocs, so-called trade barriers, in existence among other nations outside the Axis?

/ I believe there were. I am not an expert on that subject.

Q Can you tell us whether or not, as an official of the State Department, if the United States was unable to break these trade barriers elsewhere, was it not insisting upon a unilateral obligation for Japan by insisting upon free trade between China and Japan?

A You used the word "insisting." I would like to make a little explanation of that point.

8

5

6

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

10

...

21

22

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: That is argumentative. MR. BLEWETT: I think I asked the witness, 2 your Honor, if he could answer that as an official of 3 the State Legartment. He is attempting to, sir. 4 THE PRESIDENT: You are asking him can he provide an argument as an official. We don't want 6 7 that. We want fact from him. 8 Q Do you have, Mr. Ballantine, from your long stay in Japan and China, any particular prejudice 10 toward the Chinese as opposed to the Jananeses 11 I hope I have no projudice against any monle. 12 Did you write any other books, pamphlets or 13 erticles, other than your Japanese grammar? 14 I don't recall any published articles or 15 pamphlets. 16 I think you stated that, in your cross-exam-17 inction, with regard to the removal of troops, in one 18 instance the Department did not consider it seriously 19 because it would not be approved by Chiang Kai-shek. 20 Is that correct' 21 I believe that what I said was that whatever formulas we had received from the Japanese, there were 23 no formulas that we thought on that question that we 24

had received that Chiang Kai-shek would accept.

Tas there not a very strong, influential

1 business group in the United States that opposed any 2 agreement between Japan and the United States that did not exclude all troops from China? 3 THE PRESIDENT: He can speak only for the State Department. We don't want his ominion about what the 6 American people thought independently of that. MR. BLEWETT: I meent to specify that, your 8 Honor, but I overlooked it. 9 I meent, was there any pressure brought upon 10 your Department by any business group or individuals 11 with regard to an agreement between Japan and China 12 or the United States? 13 A There was not. 14 Q Were there not reports received by you, as 15 director of Far Eastern. Affairs, indicating that Japan 16 was becoming largely a competitive nation? 17 A I wasn't director of Far Eastern Affairs at 18 that time. 19 Q Well, then, in your capacity in the State 20 Department as adviser. 21 I suppose from time to time there were ques-22 tions raised by trade groups in regard to Japanese 23 trade, but those -- if there were they went to our

economic people and I don't know much about that. In

eny case, that had no bearing upon the conversations

this treaty or agreement?

A Neturally we had to consider what kind of an agreement we could carry Congress with.

Is it not a fact, Mr. Ballantine, that Medeme Chieng Kai-shek has many very influential friends in "ashington and in the United States?

THE PRESIDENT: That is beyond the scope of the affidavit.

Q Regarding the freezing order of July, 1941, what was the meaning of the State Department in terming it a move for self-defense?

4. Well, when a desperado gets in position to

1-	
1	shoot you, you don't went to give him ammunition for
2	that purpose.
3	Q Was not that order considered by the State
4	Department as practically the waging of aconomic war-
5	fere?
6	A I think the State Desertment recognized that
7	economic measures of that character could only be taken
8	in a very serious situation, but then we were concerned
9	at that moment with a very imminent and overt act which
10	necessitated our taking steps of self-defense.
11	Q Do not the records of your department indicate
12	that most wars in history have been conomic?
13	THE PRESIDENT: He need not enswer that ques-
10	tion.
15	Q Can you tell us, Mr. Ballantine, from your
16	Department's knowledge of the psychology of the Japanes
17	generally, might not this action of freezing be con-
18	sidered by the Janunese as an act of hostility?
19	A were conserned, as I said before, then
20	with this question of self-defense which, in view of
21	the imminence of the peril that was created by Japan's
22	move into southern Indo-China that consideration
23	over-rode any other consideration in the situation.
2-i	I think I explained that in my affidavit.
	I CHILIN I CAPTELLING OFFI

Q 'ell, what I wanted to know, if you can tell

2

9

6

8

0

10

11.

13

16

17

20

21

22

2-1

25

me, is, from your knowledge of the Japanese people, how that action was received out here, not what the attitude of the United States was concerning it.

any expert knowledge of the Japanese. In any case, I suppose the Tribunal can be trusted to form its own conclusions as to the purpose and affect of freezing.

MR. PLEWETT: Yes, sir.

- Q I assume, however, Mr. Ballantine, that it must have had some deterrent as regards to the negotiations, did it not?
- A The Secretary of State had already suspended the conversations before the freezing order, and after the freezing order it was the Japanese who came back to us and asked that the conversations be resumed.
- Q Was the entry of Japanese troops into Indo-China concluded under an agreement or not?
- A We don't know the nature of all the factors that went into that situation. That was between the Japanese and Hitler and the Vichy Government.
- Q "ell, was there not a formal treaty drawn up and signed by the parties involved?
 - A My understanding is that there was.
- Q Was it not considered at the time of the negotictions that an actual state of war existed between

Japan and China, regardless of the terms?

A Obviously. Very large scale hostilities had been going on for four years.

Q Could or could not Japan have been justified in sending troops to Indo-China as a measure against the Chinese?

THE PLESIDENT: That calls for an opinion which we don't want from the witness.

of State by someone early in April, 1941, that Japan was prepared to enter into an agreement nulifying the Tripartite Pact. To you recall who made those representations, Ar. Ballantine, and whether or not they were ever reduced to writing or any document?

A As I indicated -- or perhaps I didn't -Father Drought told me orally that that was what his
Japanese contacts had said to him. We got nothing in
writing from any authoratitive source on that.

conversation or that proposal anywhere in the Lapartment: Throughout the negotiations there seems to be
some indication with reference to President Roosevelt and
Secretary Hull that there was a variance between the
representations made by the accredited representatives
of Japan and the Japanese press. Bid your Department

2

1

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

feel that these ambassadors were authorized to executa on agreement if a meeting of the minds had occurred? A If a meeting of minds had occurred and we had proceeded to negotiations, then there would have been full powers communicated, exchanged between the two governments as to whom the negotiators would be. That question, therefore, never crose. THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Thereuron, of 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, ofter which the proceedings were resumed es follows:)

24

D MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International u 1 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. 2 T. E PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett. & 3 BY IR. BLE"ETT (Continued): W 4 Are you familiar, Mr. Ballantine, with Mr. 011 5 Hull's testimony before the Pearl Harbor Committee? 6 1 A I am. 7 Is it true that he stated that these negoti-8 ations were taken up for the purpose of peace in the 9 Pacific and at the same time to get time for armament of the U.S.A.? 11 A I'd like to refresh my memory on the exact 1.2 quotation of his statement. 13 Q He stated --14 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett, be careful 15 when you purport to say what Mr. Hull said that you 16 quote his exact words. You may have done so. MR. BLEWETT: I have a quotation, sir, that 18 I think is correct from that statement, but if the 19 20 witness does not recognize that, sir, I will not 21 pursue it. 2.2 THE PRESIDENT: He may if you put Mr. Hull's 23 exact words. 24 IR. HIGGINS: Mr. President. 25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Higgins.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HIGGINS: I object to this testimeny. It is not an act of Mr. Hull as Secretary of State, but as a witness before some investigating committee and the report of that would be the best evidence of what Mr. Hull said, if he did make a statement.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett is pursuing the conventional course. We cannot very well stop him. We do not want the whole of that inquiry in evidence. The witness has said he is familiar with what Mr. Hull said.

MR. HIGGINS: There is no evidence that Mr. Ballartine was present.

THE PRESIDENT: Hearsay is admissible in this Tribunal.

MR. BLEVETT: I read, sir, from page 554 of Congressional Investigation of Pearl Harbor Attack of the 27th, just one paragraph, sir:

"But our policy was not to say no to the Japanese ultimatum of November 20. It was not to remain silent even. It was to grab at every straw in sight in an effort to keep up the conversations and to give time to our armies and navies here and among our future allies, to make further preparation and also to show our continuing interests in peace."

Q Was that a concept of the State Department's

policies at that time?

THE PRESIDENT: During the negotiations.

MR. BLEWETT: Yes.

A I think you will find a similar statement in the summary of conversations in the record of Foreign Relations, United States-Japan, 1931 to 1941." It was our desire and our hope to meet the expectations of the American people who desired peace. We wanted to keep alive the spark of peace to the last split second. We wanted to clutch at every straw that might make possible the continuance of peace. Surely there was nothing inconsistent between that objective and giving our armed forces and those of our friends time to prepare adequately for self-defense.

Q Could you, therefore, confidently have any great discernment or realization that an agreement could be reached under such circumstances?

THE PRESIDENT: Did the Department think that one could be reached under those circumstances?

THE WITNESS: Under those circumstances we would be all the more anxious to take anything that was possible, but surely we weren't going to sacrifice our principles.

Q Did the President of the United States, in his Navy Day speech on October 27, 1941, infer that the

United States was reedy to fight Japan?

THE PRESIDENT: Put it this way: "Did the President make this observation on that date;" then quote his exact words, if it is not already in evidence, and I do not think it is.

MR. BLEWETT: We have sent to Washington for a copy of the speech, sir -- for an excerpt -- but it has not been received by us as yet. I do not know whether the prosecution has it. I think the witness is familiar with the speech however, your Honor. If he says not, I shall not pursue the question.

THE "ITNESS: I am not familiar with the speech.

THE PRESIDENT: We want nothing but the exact words used in these speeches.

MR. BLEWETT: I understand, sir.

1-1

1

2

5

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

Q Are you familiar with the speech of Mr. Churchill shortly thereafter at the Lord Nayor's dinner, which excerpt has been admitted in evidence here?

A I would have to have my memory refreshed on thet.

MR. BLE ETT: If your Monor insists, I do not have the exhibit handy so I am unable to read it. May I cuote one portion of it to the witness and see if he recalls that?

THE PRUSIDER: Are you noing to ask him what was the effect of Mr. Churchill's words on the American State Department? I do not see why you should ask the question because his speech is in evidence.

Q In view of these manifestations throughout the attempted nerotiations, including the freezing order, embargoes, aid to China, was it inconceivable to your Department that Japan might have had some doubts as to the United States' sincerity?

THE PRESIDENT: Can he testify as to the Japanese doubts without expressing an opinion unless they told him that they had them and what they were?

MR. BLEVETT: I would assume, sir, that there must have been some indication of their attitude throughout these long discussions.

THE PRESIDENT: He told us vesterday that he wasn't affected by their demeanor. Apart from that, we have only their words and their actions.

vitness might possibly be an expert in so far as his knowledge of the Japanese psychology hav be concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: For the time being we recommize no such expert.

State Department, to Seel -- cross cut ""ecl" -- as regards Japanese preparations for mar, 1 masmue' as the United States was undergoing the same progress at the time?

A United States was not out in force on a course of widespread aggression. Our self-defense preparations began to take place a long time after the Japanese forward movement began.

of If the foreign policy of the State Department was positive in May or June 1941, "'w was it not set forth explicitly; and if not received or not accepted by Japan, why were not these me obtained and concluded?

A The American Covernment was sincerely and earnestly desirous of working for peace to the last possible moment at anything the Japanese came to us

3

6

7

5

8

9

10

13

12

14

16

17 18

20

21

19

22

25

24

and said they wanted a peaceful settlement. We employed patiently and up to the end the possibilities of peace.

O May we assume from your affidavit, Mr. Ballantire, that at no time during the course of these negotiations were the Japanese representatives sincere?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that again asks him to express an opinion on the state of mind of the Japanese. He has already dealt with that very fully.

affidavit, your Fonor, that that was his expression, that that was his opinion, that they were not sincere, at no time. Of course, he can answer that. If not, why that is so. But that is the impression I received from reading the offidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Let him answer.

A It is difficult to elaborate on what I have already said. We had to take into consideration, when we entered into the conversations, Janan's past record. At the outset of the conversations there was nothing particularly that indicated insincerity. But as conversations progressed, it was difficult to reconcile these assertions of their panceful desires with the specific formulas that they proposed for settlement.

Japanese Government had accepted the terms of

Nevember 25, 1941, would that not have tractically made a subjugated state or nation of Japan? THE PRESIDENT: That is a matter of opinion for us, not of fact for him. 1.4

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Mr. Ballantine, did you write or dictate this affidavit personally?

THE PRESIDENT: That was answered almost at the beginning of the cross-examination.

MR. BLEVETT: It is my recollection, sir, that it has, but I thought at that time he referred to the preparation of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is a short answer. Get it from him.

MR. BLEWETT: It is not important, sir.

I will waive it, if your Honor thinks that -
THE PRESIDENT: Let him answer.

A Yes, I dictated that affidavit.

Q Now could not your statement in great part be based upon a reconstruction of happenings and events in the light of Pearl Harbor; and could they not have been formed on what appears to you to be a deliberate prepared policy, but what actually constituted a sincere effort to effect an agreement by Japan for peace and economic security?

THE PRESIDENT: If we understand that question rightly, you are still asking for his opinion.

MR. BLEWETT: Well, your Honor, hindsight sometimes creates -- may not create the proper viewpoint

in a situation. The past events may be strongly indicative of a course of action, but I am simply asking the witness if this prepared statement might not have been made on a reconstructive basis.

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose he acted on every bit of knowledge he possessed including the war. You are asking him, in effect, what sort of an affidavit would he have drafted or have signed if Pearl Harbor had never happened. That is purely hypothetical.

MR. BLEVETT: I am endeavoring, your Honor, to paint it more specifically to the attitude of these representatives of Japan while these negotiations were going on. Now, after all these years, and after the developments, it may strongly indicate that they were insincere.

THE PRESIDENT: Has not the Court to decide that in the light of all of the evidence before it without any assistance from Mr. Ballantine's opinion?

MR. BLEWETT: I believe your Honor is correct in that, sir. That concludes my questioning.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:

Q If the Tribunal please: Mr. Witness, were you present, Mr. Ballantine, at all of the Hull-Stimson

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this final conversation?

conferences concerning Japanese-American relations 1 while the negotiations were going on? 2 I was not present at any of the conferences 3 between Mr. Hull and Mr. Stimson. 5 Then do you know from the records of the 6 State Department on what date -- exact date -- Mr. 7 Hull declared to Mr. Stimson that negotiations were 8 no longer useful? A I do not recall the words which you quote 10 at all. Yesterday, you testified that Mr. Hull had told to Mr. Stimson in effect that the negotiations were through. Can you tell us the exact date of that conversation? I said yesterday that Mr. Hull had said: "The matter is now in the hands of the Army and Navy." If I recall correctly, he said that on November 27th. In any case, the facts are set forth in the Pearl Harbor Inquiry. What I am getting to, Mr. Ballantine, is: If Mr. Hull, according to the records of the State Department, made any preparatory remarks at any other time during the negotiations to Mr. Stimson before

As I said, I was not present at any of the

.

conversations or conferences between Mr. Hull and Mr. Stimson. My knowledge of what was said is derived either from what Mr. Hull told me personally afterwards, or from the records in connection with the Pearl Harbor Inquiry; and I could not undertake to give any clear sequence of those statements without refreshing my mind from the Pearl Harbor record.

Q Now let us go to the American State Department's attitude toward the Tripartite Pact. Would you say that it was definitely the foreign policy of Mr. Hull and the State Department to totally divorce Japan from Germany in the event of the extension of the war in Europe to include the United States' participation?

A Japan came to us and asked for an agreement covering peace in the Pacific area. Naturally, before concluding such an agreement, we wanted to make sure that Japan would not attack us if we got involved in Europe.

Q That does not answer my question, Mr. Ballantine. Would you say that it was definitely the foreign policy of Mr. Hull and the State Department to totally divorce Japan from its responsibilities under the Tripartite Pact to Germany in the event

3

4

6

7

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

the United States became involved in the European war?

THE PRESIDENT That involves the determination by the witness of Japan's responsibilities to Germany and Italy under the Tripartite Pact.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: May the witness answer? THE PRESIDENT: No. He can say whether it was the desire of America to keep Japan out of a war should the United States become involved in one in Europe -- the desire of the State Department -and he gave his answer in the second part of the last answer.

- Q Well, Mr. Ballantine, was this policy that was expressed to the Japanese Ambassadors all through the negotiations?
 - I don't know what you mean by "this policy".
 - Q The policy which you have expressed.
- We made our position clear to the Japanese from the very outset of the conversations.
- Was it the position of the State Department that if Japan had made an agreement to annul the responsibilities under the Tripartite Pact that that would constitute a breach of that pact?
- A Mr. Hull repeatedly told the Japanese that he would leave it to the Japanese what they could do.

the interpretation of the responsibilities of Japan under the Tripertite Pact one of the controlling factors in the two parties' inability to complete the negotiations?

A I would put it this way: The failure --

A I would put it this way: The failure -our failure to obtain clarification from the Japanese
as to what they would do in case we became involved
in the war in the Atlantic was one of the factors
which made it difficult for us to reach an agreement.

Q Did not -- was not the Pact in effect when Germany and Russia went to war and Japan not joining Germany, didn't that give the United States sufficient basis for determining whether or not Japan would go to war in the event of further extension of the European war?

THE PRESIDENT: It is not for him to answer that.

THE "ITNESS: I did not understand you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: It is not for you to answer that. You are asked to weigh up considerations and give your own opinion, do you realize it?

Q During these negotiations, had not the State Department understood that Germany considered

a virtual state of war existed between the United
States and Germany from President Roosevelt's Navy
Day speech and other acts that were committed after
that and before that?

THE PRESIDENT: Read that question to me,
Mr. Reporter, please.

(Whereupon, the last question was
read by the official court reporter.)

THE PRESIDENT: He may answer if he can.

A I don't know what Germany considered.

Q The State Department was carrying on diplomatic relations with Germany at that time, were they not?

A We had diplomatic relations.

Q Now, Mr. Ballantine, we will go to another subject. What did the State Department have in mind, or what was their plan or program in the event these negotiations failed?

A I don't know that any conclusion had been reached on that. The Japanese had said that in the event of failure of the negotiations, that the consequences would be most unfortunate. We felt that we could go so far, and if we could not go any further, we would just stand and take the consequences.

Q In your answer to Mr. Blewett you suggested

 that unless the arrangements or the fixed policy of the United States as settled by the 1922 Conference were carried out, that you could not make an agreement. Now this fixed policy, as you have expressed it, it was the opinion of the State Department that unless this fixed policy was carried out, even if it meant war, is that correct?

A It meant that we were unwilling to surrender our principles no matter what the consequences.

Q Did it not also mean that even in the light of the changed circumstances between the time of the fixed policy was settled until the time the negotiations were going on, you would not go beyond a certain limit even if it meant war?

A The changed circumstances were Japan's breaking away from the Nine-Power Treaty of which she was a party. Our position on that is abundantly set clear in a note which we addressed to the Japanese Government on December 30, 1938, which I believe is in evidence before this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

24	
G T	1
e	2
n b	3
e	4
g	5
&	6
В	7
-a r	8
t	9
n	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	22
	23
	24

	Carlotte Carlotte Carlotte Carlotte
A THE PROPERTY STATES	CTCCTO
U Mailin Market Market	20 20 20 1110
AFTERNOON	DEFORTOR

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

JOSEPH W. BALLANTINE, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM (Continued):

Q Mr. Ballantine, we go now to the question of to what extent were the Japanese-American negotiations which were going on made public at the time?

A They were not made public.

Q Well, was Germany, with whom diplomatic relations continued until December 11, 1941, kept informed or were the negotiations purposely kept from them by both sides at the request of the USA?

A We were conducting informal, exploratory conversations to determine whether a basis for a negotiation existed. The stage of the negotiation was never reached.

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Did the Department of State feel that a basis of negotiation had never been arrived at?

That is correct.

Were the B,C,D Powers kept informed of all the conversations and exploratory conferences?

They were informed that we were having informal, exploratory conversations. But, no -- they were not given any information in regard to the contents of those things except in connection with the Japanese-proposed modus vivendi and our proposed modus vivendi. I do not recall definitely whether the exact Japanese proposal of November 20 -- whether they were informed of the details of that. I am not sure about that.

Did the State Department express its official dissatisfaction at MATSUOKA's expression of view concerning the negotiations which came to the attention of the German officials?

I am not clear to what you refer.

In a speech by MATSUOKA in which he discussed the negotiations, was there not an official protest or suggestion made by the United States that these negotiations be kept secret?

In so far as I recall, no representations were made to the Japanese Government or to the

3

5

7

8

10

11

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

2425

Japanese representatives requesting that the conversations be kept secret. On the contrary, it was the Japanese who asked us or who impressed upon us the desirability that the conversations be kept secret.

Q Was this Foreign Minister TOYODA or Foreign Minister MATSUOKA's policy?

A I don't know whose policy it was.

Q Did the State Department consider that
Germany was within her rights in asking Japan to
adhere to the responsibilities under the Tripartite
Pact in the event America entered the European
War?

A I don't know that the State Department gave consideration to that.

Q Now we pass to another question, Mr. Ballantine. During your course of negotiations as an official of the State Department, did any other nation offer its good offices in mediation of the differences between the United States and Japan?

A The only thing I recall of that nature was a conversation between the Australian representative and the Secretary of State Hull towards the latter part of November. He proposed to have a talk with the Japanese representatives. Mr. Hull said he had no objection but thought that nothing would come of it.

1 Who was this gentleman or officia:? Q I believe that Mr. Bichard Casey was the 2 3 Australian Minister at that time. 4 THE PRESIDENC: Did Mr. Casey claim that he 5 was acting at the instance of Japan? 6 THE WIDESS: He did not. 7 THE PASSYDENT: The only relevance of that 8 question put by Mr. Durningham is les ocaring on 9 the Hague Convention of 190%. 10 BY MR. COMMINGHAM (Continued): 11 G Car the name, Mr. Britantine, toy leader 12 or power suggested in any of the deliberations on 13 the United States on Japan's slike, which had not taken 14 a stand on the war as the tame, which could have 15 judged the matter and settled the differences 16 impartially? If so, who was that power, and what 17 was the influence? 18 That question never arose at the time. 19 Was eny artempt made by the State Department 20 or Japan at the beginning of the negotiations to 21 arbitrate or submit the differences to an impartial 22 body? 23 I don't know what Japan did. The State 24 Department -- the Japanese came to us and asked for 25

an agreement, and we entered into conversations

toward that agreement. The question didn't arise.

Then you considered the possibility of war only on one side. That calls for your opinion, and I will withdraw that.

Had not Great Britain and the Netherlands and Canada and other countries shown their willingness to stand by the decision of the United States on these matters?

I have no knowledge that those governments gave the United States a blank check to settle things for them in any way. What we had envisaged was that, after reaching what we thought was a basis of an agreement, that we would go to these other powers and discuss the matter with them then.

Q Did you or Mr. Hull or any other official in the State Department have any conferences with the British and other Ambassadors and representatives, keeping them informed of the developments?

A Mr. Hull had conferences with the diplomatic representatives of the friendly nowers from time to time. I can't recall offhand the exact details of what he said. But, so far as I know, there was no discussion of the details of the progress of the conversations in regard to the points involved therein.

10 11

12

15

20

22

23

24

21

22

23

24

25

Q Were they not disposed to leave the details of the negotiations in the hands of Mr. Roosevelt and the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull?

A As I have said before, we hadn't got up to any negotiations.

Q Let us revert to the Chinese-Japanese relations. Was the State Department in a position to present a plan on August 10, 1/37 that the Japanese-United States relations concerning China were such that America could act as mediator for China and Japan settlement?

A My understanding is that we did not offer mediation; we merely offered good offices.

Q Was this to promote the interests of the United States or for some other purpose?

A It was for the purpose of restoring and maintaining peace.

Q All of these transactions between the United States and Japan were carried on uninterrupted regard-less of who occupied the Cabinet or the main governmental posts in the Japanese Government; is that correct?

A Are you referring to conversations in 1941?

Q I am referring to the general course of Japanese-American relations over the period of years

testified to by you in your affidavit.

A We pursued a consistent policy towards

Japan throughout our relations, irrespective of what
group or power -- party might be in power in Japan.

Q Were your negotiations solely with the officials in power, or were there other negotiations during that period with economic and industrial and other interests?

A Negotiations of the State Department were with the Japanese Government.

Q From your answer to Mr. Blewett, I believe it was, or Mr. Blakeney, you suggested that Mr. Grew was only giving the point of view of Tokyo, and I wondered if it was official Tokyo which you were expressing the view about.

A What I intended was, Mr. Grew was giving the viewpoint as he saw it from where he was in Tokyo.

Q In response to a question by Mr. Blewett you suggested that America began preparation for war a long time after the Japanese forward movement began. Can you give us the date at which the State Department determined that "movement began"?

A I don't know if the State Department made any official determination as to when that forward movement began.

Q Then how can you set the time at which the United States began preparation for war?

A In the autumn of 1940, Japan concluded an

A In the autumn of 1940, Japan concluded an alliance with Hitler's Germany and with Italy. If you will read some of the speeches of some of the Japanese leaders following that alliance and read the speeches of the German representatives, you will see many references to the creation of a New Order throughout the world. It was a world movement of conquest.

Q Then how can you set the time when the United States began preparation for war? That's my question.

A It is perfectly clear that the United States was a peace loving nation, that the United States was not coveting anybody else's territory or was not out on a course of aggression. It is perfectly clear that our nation did not want war even as late as the summer of 1941. The extension of the Selective Service Act was passed by only one vote in the House of Representatives.

Q When did the State Department notify the War Department that they better get ready for war?

A The Secretary of State, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the President were

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regard to the matter. certainly was a forward movement. to say about that. question. Let's go to the next:

in consulation throughout the administration. I don't know when any particular statement was made in

I just want to know what you mean when you say, "A long time after the Japanese forward movement began, the United States began preparation for war."

Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 was in clear violation of the Nine-Power Treaty. That

That's what you said in your affidavit, Mr. Ballantine. But, was that ever decided by a tribunal or any body created for the purpose of determining a legal liability under the Nine-Power Pact?

I think the League of Nations had something

Well, it looks like we are stymied on that

Did not the State Department consider that wire tapping and interception of mail and messages was an unfriendly act not countenanced between friendly nations and contrary to international law?

THE PRESIDENT: If wire tapping was the cause of the war and there could be a justification for it, there might be something in that question.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: My only reason in asking

. 25

that was to show that there was bad faith in the transaction. How could there be good faith --THE PRESIDENT: I cannot argue with you at this stage, Mr. Cunningham. But, it is not a practical viewpoint.

BY Mk. CUNNINGHAM: (Contin	nued)

Now, about the intercepted messages. Were the intercepted messages transmitted immediately to the State and War Departments from the time the intercaption began?

A They were communicated to the State Department when they were translated.

and Navy Departments immediately?

. The War and Wavy Departments were on the receiving end -- were on the sending end. The State Department was on the receiving end.

Q That was my understanding, Mr. Ballantine, but I merely wanted to show that those departments had received the messages.

Mr. Ballantine, when the exploration of a basis for negotiations began was it understood by the State Department officials that if an agreement were not reached that a state of war would ensue?

A No.

Q When did that conclusion -- when was that conclusion arrived at by the State Department?

THE PRESIDENT: They didn't arrive at any.

He gave you a negative answer. You asked him whether war would be decided upon if the negotiations failed.

he said that there was no such decision. That is 2 the end of it. 3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: A few qualification ques-4 tions, your honor, that were passed over in the be-5 ginning. 6 Q Mr. Ballantine, is your appearance here 7 voluntary? Did you ask to be sent here as a witness? 8 A I did not. 9 Mr. CUNNINGHAM: That is all. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren. 11 MA. WARREN: If the Tribunal please. 12 ChOSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 15 BY MA. WARKEN: 14 (Now, in answer to a question by Mr. Cun-15 ningham you stated in substance that it was perfectly 16 clear that late in the year of 1941 that the United 17 States did not want war. 18 A That is a fact. 19 Q Were you speaking of the people of the 20 United States or the men in high stations, such as 21 Cordell Hull and President Roosevelt and his ad-22 visers? 23 A I am speaking of both. 24 Q Now, I will ask you if you are familiar 25

with a statement by President Roosevelt as early as

October 8, 1940, in which he stated, and I quote, that if the Japanese attacked Thailand and the Kra Peninsula or the Dutch East Indies we would not enter the war; that if they even attacked the Philippines he doubted whether we would enter the war, but that they could not always avoid making mistakes and that as the war continued and the area of operations expanded, sooner or later they would make a mistake and we would enter the war.

A I have no recollection of such a statement.

Q Do you recall a Cabinet meeting on November 25th, which was attended by Secretary Hull, Secretary Knox, Secretary Stimson, General Marshall, Admiral Stark -- rather, I said Cabinet meeting; I meant a conference -- in which the situation was discussed and at that time they started on the problem as, I am quoting, how we should maneuver them, the Japanese, into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves?

A Are you referring to Mr. Stimson's report in 1945 of that conference?

I am referring to a meeting that took place on November 25th, which is referred to in the investigations of that committee with reference to Pearl Harbor. A I have read the record of that Pearl Harbor, but in 1941 I had no knowledge whatsoever of any content of such a meeting such as you read.

Q I am referring only to your statement that nobody in high place in the United States as late as 1941 wanted war. Now, are you familiar with the discussions that Cordell Hull, together with other

men, had with the President of the United States with reference as to whether or not the people of the United States would back them if they determined upon a course of war against Japan?

A I am sure that neither Cordell Hull nor the President ever had in mind an aggressive war against Japan.

asking you if it isn't a fact that those discussions took place.

I have no knowledge of discussions of the nature you have described other than what I read in the Pearl Harbor keport.

Q As one of a team of advisers to Secretary Hull, were you not informed of the opinion and the ultimate aim of these men in high stations?

A I was informed that it was the aim of these men in high station that they should strive for peace

questions?

25

to the very last. 1 Q With reference to that, are you acquainted 2 with a Stanley Hornbeck? 3 A I am. 4 What was his position at the time you were 5 on this advisory commission relative to Cordell Hull? 6 THE PRESIDENT: He has already told us. He 7 8 can say it again. 9 MR. WARLEN: I didn't hear your Honor's re-10 mark. 11 THE PRESIDENT: He already told us of his 12 position, but he can repeat it. 13 MR. WALKEN: Your Honor, perhaps the question 14 is misunderstood. I mean what was his position re-15 lative to Cordell Hull, not his official position -16 as to friendship, and so forth. 17 THE PRESIDENT: Well, you didn't suggest friendship. 19 I am not in a position to testify as to any-20 thing more than his position in the State Department. 21 Is it not true that Mr. Hornbeck was more 22 in the confidence of Cordell Hull than any other per-23 son in the State Department, dealing with Far Eastern 24

A Mr. Hull made his own decisions. In

conferences Mr. Hornbeck, Mr. Hamilton and myself, were all treated as equals.

THE PRESIDENT: You told us before you were the junior of the three, but you were still treated as an equal.

THE WITNESS: That's right.

With the numerous memoranda prepared by Mr. Hornbeck and for Mr. Hull that got rather wide circulation through the State Department, concerning Japan and our relations with Japan, were you not?

A I was.

Q Those memoranda dealt with the economic strangulation that was being placed on Japan by the United States Government in connection with other governments, did they not, for the most part?

A Mr. hornbeck's memoranda dealt with a great variety of subjects.

Q Quite right, but almost invariably is it not true that they refused -- I mean rather, that in his memoranda he refused to credit Ambassador Grew and Mr. Dooman's advice on the situation in Japan and the Far East?

A I wouldn't concur in any such generalization.

We will put it on the major issues to which 1 you have testified. I don't think that even on the major issues that it would be fair, without a considerable amount of thought and review of those memoranda, to make such a statement. 6 Now, with reference -- I ask you if you were familiar with the memoranda he wrote concerning the strangulation by economic senctions against them -rather, not sanctions but economical .strangulation of Japan -- to force Japan to do what the United States wanted Japan to do. Are you familiar with that? I don't recall such a memoranda. Do you know what happened to his memoranda as soon as war was declared? A I do not. Is it not a fact that it was common knowledge in the State Department that a mad scramble was made to recover all of those memoranda and keep them from the knowledge of the American people?

21

22 23

3

1

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

A It certainly wasn't within my knowledge.

Do you know whether a single one of those memoranda appear in any record in the State Department at the present time?

I think you have to make a distinction between

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

two kinds of memoranda: memoranda which are in the official records and a personal memoranda. So far as I know, the memoranda in the official records is still there. I do know that all the recorded memoranda in which the Pearl Harbor Committee was interested were made available to them. Do you not also know that in all the mass of material given to the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee that not a single one of Mr. Hornbeck's memoranda was produced, his official memoranda relating to the subjects we have under discussion? I distinctly recall a number of his memoranda on these subjects being mimeographed by the Pearl Harbor Committee. Q Were these the memoranda in which he spoke very freely concerning his attitude toward Japan? I have no definite recollection of the contents of those memoranda. Q Precisely. Now I will ask you if Cordell Hull and Mr. Hornbeck were not opposed from the very

23 24

25

the two nations?

A Mr. Hull was ninety-nine and nine-tenths
per cent of the State Department. Mr. Hull's attitude

outsat to having President Roosevelt meet with Prince

KONOYE in an attempt to settle the differences between

on that thing is made clear in the record. That is to say that he felt, as we all felt, that some clear commitments by Japan on general principles and their application should be arrived at prior to a meeting.

As a result of his attitude he used his influence to dissuade President Roosevelt from having a meeting, is that not true?

A As far as I know, the President and Mr. Hull had exactly the same attitude on that proposed meeting.

Q Are you acquainted with the real off the record proceedings and discussions with President Roosevelt about that and his discussion with Admiral NOMURA?

A I was not present at any discussions which the President had with the Japanese representatives, therefore I only know what is on the record.

Q Now, what I am interested in, of course, is your personal knowledge of these matters, because we have the record. I will ask you this: if in that instance his dissuasion, or his concurrence with the President, whichever it may have been -- if he didn't refuse to follow the advice of his Ambassador here in Japan?

THE PRESIDENT: He covered this yesterday. Can he say more?

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I think so. Here is

23 24

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

my reason for it.

THE PRESIDENT: Ask him.

MR. WARREN: What?

THE PRESIDENT: Ask him.

A All I can say is this, that Mr. Grew's recommendations, what he stated, is in the record.

Mr. Hull's position from the beginning, and the President's position are crystal clear. I don't know what I can add to them.

Q You could add a great deal if you would concerning your personal knowledge of the workings and cross-workings of the State Department there and the opinions of some and the opinions of others that you must have come in contact with.

THE PRESIDENT: You must not suggest the witness is suppressing anything.

MR. WARREN: Well, I don't mean that, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless you can put to him something which you know he is suppressing, or believe he is.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I am sorry. The man asked me a question and I see that he didn't understand what I was driving at and I merely told him. I don't think he is suppressing anything because I don't

19

20

21 22

23 24

think he is that type of man. I think he is very 1 truthful. 2 Q Why did Mr. Hull suddenly abandon the modus 3 vivendi? 4 A As Mr. Hull explained in his Pearl Herbor 5 testimony very clearly, the Chinese were very much 6 opposed to it. We felt, or Mr. Hull felt that it would 7 be a very discouraging factor on the Chinese, who were being very hard pressed, might cause their resistance 9 10 to collapse. The other powers were lukewarm toward it. There was a strong body of opinion in the United 11 12 States who we felt would be opposed to it. 13 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen 14 minutes. 15 (Whoreupon, at 1445, a recess was 16 taken until 1500, after which the proceedings 17 were resumed as follows:) 20

18

19

21

22

23

24

	MARSMAL (OF THE C	orar: Th	ne Inter	national
l'illitary	Tribunal	for the	For East	is nov	resumed.
	THE PRES	IDENT:	Colonel '	arren.	

MR. 'ARREN: Thank you, sir.

BY MR. WARREN (Continuing):

Q I don't know whether you have been asked this question or not: Is it not a fact that one of the reasons advanced to President Roosevelt by the State Department for not wanting to talk with Prince KOFOYE was the fact that the State Department did not believe that the Army and Navy in Japan would back Prince KOFOYE?

A All I can say is that it was the belief of the President -- as far as I know, because I didn't talk to him -- and of the Secretary of State that the Japanese Government, whoever happened to be the spokesman at that time, was not likely to yield on the courses with it was pursuing.

Q Fay I take your answer to mean that that was one of the reasons advanced for not wanting the meeting?

TWE PRESIDENT: You are asked, what was President Roosevelt's attitude?

IR. "ARREN: No, your Fonor, I am asking him if that wasn't one of the reasons advanced by the State Department to President Roosevelt to get him to

change his mind about the meeting.

A Well, all I know about the matter is what is in the record. I don't know of any -- I don't know the contents of any conversations which Mr. Hull may have had with the President other than what is in the record.

o Toll, is that in the record?

A In the record is what the President said in his messages and his communications to the Japanese.

Q Is it not true that the State Department informed Ambassador Grew that such was the case and that they did not believe that any agreement made by Prince KONOYE would be backed up by the Army and Navy?

A I do not know of any instructions sent by the Department of State other than -- of that nature other than those reporting or communicating the contents of the statements that we had given to the Japanese. At least, I cannot recall any at the present moment.

Q Now, I am referring specifically to things that occurred outside the record in the informal talks or informal telegrams that went back and forth.

A All our belograms to I'r. Crow were official telegrams and I think all of them -- I am sure all of them were made available to the Pearl Parbor Committee; and I do not recall any such ressage.

Q Is it not true that the Japanese Government had gone so far as to have a ship under steam in Tokyo Bay with the highest Navy and Army officers obtainable ready to accompany Prince KONOYE at any time that Mr. Hull or the President would say the word?

A That is what they told us.

Q Is it not also true that Prince KONOYE informed Ambassador Grow that a failure to bring about the meeting would mean a fall of his Cabinet, and that unquestionably he was the last person in Japan who could possibly bring about a situation where peace might be restored between the two nations?

A Well, I don't remember the exact words, but

generally something to that effect Mr. Grew reported to us.

Q Yes. Mr. Grow also reported that he believed Prince KONOYE was telling the truth, and that the situation was extremely grave and action should be taken on it, did he not?

A If I recall correctly, he reported to that general effect.

25

It was common knowledge within the State Department, was it not, that abandonment of the proposed modus vivendi and the note which was substituted 3 by Mr. Hull for the modus vivendi would end negotiations with Japan; wasn't that generally known? None of the matters relating to the conversations were matters of common knowledge in the 7 Department. It was -- the knowledge was confined to a very few persons. 9 That is what I thought. But those persons 10 did not then nor of their own volition have they since 11 made a full disclosure to the American people of their 12 negotiations, have they? 13 Would you mind repeating that question? 14 Q Will the reporter read the question. 15 (Whereupon, the last question was 16 read by the official court reporter.) 17 There is only one person to make a statement 18 of action by the Department of State; that is the 19 Secretary of State. I consider that the Secretary of 20 State has made a very full statement -- complete 21 22 statement. 23

Q When, and where is it? When did he make it and where is it?

A I would say Foreign Relations Japan, 1931 to

1941, which was published as soon as we could get
the publication together afterwards, and also the
Pearl Harbor record. I think the President's report
on December 15 -- I think the Joint Committee
of Congress, December 15, 1941, was -- We got together
as much material as we could hurriedly to make that
public, also.

Q Do you know whether the publication that you refer to has all of the official documents contained in it?

A I believe that the publication on Foreign
Relations contains all the material matter affecting
Japan and the United States alone. The conversations
with third powers were not included at that time,
because of the war situation. In the Pearl Harbor
record all the material was made available to the
Committee, even that which had not leen put in before.

Q Who edited the publication to which you refer and determined the matters which were material?

A The Division of Publications in the Department edited the material which they thought might be of interest to historians, and in the Pearl Harbor record the question of selection was left entirely to the Jeint Committee.

Q Isn't it true that in the Pearl Harbor

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

investigation that after the testimony of Mr. Grew and before Mr. Dooman was called to the stand that the majority of the Committee decided that they would not investigate anything further with reference to the State Department other than what dealt directly with matters immediately preceding and following Pearl Harbor?

A To the best of my knowledge Mr. Dooman never testified in the Pearl Harbor Committee and I know nothing about the matter which you -- the rest of the matter to which you refer.

Q You do know that Mr. Dooman was subpoenamd, don't you?

A No.

Q Where is Mr. Dooman? What is Mr. Dooman's official position at the present time, if any, if you know?

A So far as I know, Mr. Dooman has retired from the Foreign Service.

Q Did he ever tell you the reason why?

A If he did, I don't recall them.

Q Did Mr. Hull submit himself to cross-examination on his negotiations prior to Pearl Harbor and in the Pearl Harbor Committee?

A Mr. Hull was not cross-examined by the Committee.

However, Mr. -- Senator Ferguson sent him a questionnaire of over a hundred questions to which he gave
written replies.

Q Is it true, if you know, that a report was
prepared by Ambassador Grew and his counselor, Mr.
Dooman, during their internment after the commencement
of hostilities, which was their last report to the

State Department that Mr. Hull refused to accept?

A I know nothing of a report of that description.

Goldbers & Spratt

Q Now, notwithstanding Mr. Grew's report to the State Department with reference new to Prince KONOYE's being ready to some over, what reason did you members of the State Department have for disregarding his recommendations?

THE PRESIDENT: He has already given that answer more than once.

MR. WARREN: I am sorry. That question was handed to me by another counsel. I did not think he had answered it, your Honor.

MR. SMITH: If the Court please:

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. SMITH:

Q Mr. Ballantine, were you in Tokyo in April, 1934?

A I was not.

Q You have a paragraph in your affidavit on page 2 which reads: "Nevertheless, on April 17, 1934, the Japanese Forpign Office spokesman gave out a truculent official statement known as the 'ANAU' statement. In that statement Japan made clear her purpose to compel China to follow Japan's dictates and to permit other countries to have relations with China only as Japan allowed. A copy of that statement

3.

is annexed as exhibit A."

Isn't it an error to refer to the AMAU statement of April 17, 1934 as an official statement of the Japanese Foreign Office? If you will look at your exhibit A, it is headed, "AMAU Statement -- Unofficial Statement by the Japanese Foreign Office."

A I would think that that unofficial statement-my understanding of that is it was an unofficial statement in English of a statement that had been made by
Mr. AMAU. I may be wrong about that.

Q Your affidavit appears to be based on personal knowledge, and am I to understand that you do not know anything about the subject of your own personal knowledge?

A I said in paragraph 2 of my affidavit:
"The matters herein deposed to are mainly within my
personal knowledge, otherwise they are matters with
which I am familiar from records of the Department
of State."

Q The paragraph I have just read out of your affidavit, was that written by you?

A I think, if I recall correctly, it was suggested to cover all such possibilities of matters that I should clarify in the situation, and I think the wording -- the exact wording is my own wording.

	-
1	
2	37
3	
4	18
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	,
21	
22	2.
2	3
	_

25

Q Well, the same wording appears in the statement given in testimony of Mr. Hull before the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. Can we assume that you wrote that statement from Mr. Hull's testimony?

A If I recall correctly, the idea was suggested to me by counsel here, and I wrote my own wording independently of having before me or having in mind any similar statement by Mr. Hull. I don't even recall now that he had a similar statement in his testimony.

Q After 1934 you came to Tokyo as First Secretary under Ambassador Grew; is that correct?

A Yes, in 1936 I was temporarily on duty here for four months.

Q When you made the statement which I read out of your affidavit, did you have in mind an official communication from Ambassador Grew to the Secretary of State, found in Foreign Relations Volume I, page 227, and exhibit 936 in this case, which reads as follows:

"This morning I had an interview with the Foreign Minister. Mr. HIROTA referred, on his own initiative, to the subject of the AMAU statement --"

THE MONITOR: Mr. Smith, can you give us the prosecution document on that?

MR. SMITH: 936.

THE MONITOR: Is that the P. D. number?

MR. SMITH: No, that is the exhibit number.

Prosecution Document No. 219P(23). It is not very long.

THE MONITOR: All right, sir.

(Continuing) "--regarding the attitude of Japan toward foreign assistance to China, and said that he wished to clarify that statement to me in confidence. He told me that under questioning by newspaper men, AMAU had given out the statement without his knowledge or approval, and that the world had received a wholly false impression of Japanese policy, that Japan had no intentica whatever of seeking special privileges in China, of encroaching upon the territorial and administrative integrity of China, or of creating difficulties for the bona fide trade of other countries with China. Various foreign activities have tended to disturb peaceful conditions in China, and Japan is naturally very much interested in those peaceful conditions owing to her nearness to China. But that does not mean that there is any intention or desire on the part of Japan to claim a privileged position in derogation of the rights and responsibilities to which the signatories of the Nine-Power Treaty are entitled.

3

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

15

14

16

18

19

21

22

23

1 The policy--"

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, you are reading too much.

MR. SMITH: I am down to the last sentence, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have read too much already. You are not going to do that here. If that document is too lengthy, you should deal with it in another way. You should endeavor to summarize it. This is not a case in which it is necessary to use the exact words of the person talking.

MR. SMITH: There is one more short sentence, your Honor.

Q (Continuing) "The policy of Japan is complete observance and support of the provisions of the Nine-Power Treaty in every respect."

Now my question is whether you had that document of Mr. Grew in mind when you made that statement in your affidavit?

A I had it in mind, but I also had in mind the subsequent manifestations of Japanese policies and action in China.

Q Mr. AMAU as the so-called spokesman of the Foreign Office occupied a position analagous to the American State Department of a chief of the Press

4

2

3

6

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Section, is that not right? The Chief of the Press Section in the State Department is never spoken of as the spokesman of the State Department. The spokesman of the State Department is the Secretary of State. Q Well, will you agree that Mr. AMAU was not the Foreign Minister of Japan when he made this statement? A Well, certainly I will agree. 4 Have you read Mr. Grew's book "Ten Years in Japan", especially as it deals with this AMAU statement? I read it when it first came out, but I don't recall definitely. I will read a short sentence to see if it refreshes your recollection. Referring to the AMAU statement, he says: THE PRESIDENT: Page? MR. SMITH: Page 128, your Honor. Q (Continuing) "It is difficult these days to judge whether AMAU is regarded in Japan as an enfant

terrible or a hero. It rather depends on whether

that of the chauvinists." Does that refresh your

recollection about the matter?

you seek opinions from the camp of the moderates or

A I have no recollection of it.

2

4 5

Prime Minister of Japan said on the subject to

6

Mr. Grew?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Well, then, would you explain in detail why you chose to accept an unofficial statement of a Foreign Office spokesman in preference to what the

Frime minister of vapan said on the subjec

A In the first place, Mr. AMAU's statement that he made was never repudiated publicly by the

Japanese Government so far as I recall. Mr. HIROTA's

statement was a private statement, not a public state-

ment. Finally, as I have already stated, subsequent

developments in Japanese policies in China bore out that AMAU's statement seemed to represent more clearly

what was -- what conformed more closely to subsequent

developments in Japanese policy.

Q Are you aware that on April 21st, 1931,
Mr. AMAU made another unofficial statement to the
newspapermen in which he expressed desire -- I mean
surprise -- at the interpretation which the press had
placed upon his statement of April 17th. Are you
familiar with that statement?

A Nevertheless, subsequent developments and manifestations of Japan's policy in China would bear out the interpretation that was made, which would beem to be the sound one.

I have just had handed to you Mr. AMAU's 1 own notebook as to the statement he gave out on April 21, 1934. I would like to have you read it and see if you remember that statement? 4

I do not recall having read this before, but I do not think that this explaration helps very much. There is, for example, a passage in here, "We should not forget for a moment that Japan, serving as the only cornerstone for the edifice of the peace of East Asia, bears the entire burden of responsibilities."

What else do you find in there that does not help us any?

THE PRESIDENT: You need not answer.

MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, the witness has now read a part of a statement he has not identified. I would like to offer it for identification so as to bring some order out of this situation.

THE PRESIDENT: Tender the book for identification. Is that the book?

MR. SMITH: That was obtained from Mr. AMAU, who is now in Sugamo Prison. It is his own book, and we will have to return it. It would be much better to give it an identification number and allow me to put an excerpt in for the benefit of the Clerk

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

tomorrow morning.

THE PRESIDENT! Where you read from a book or a document without tendering it, we expect it to be marked for identification, and that means custody by the Court.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, could we have a photostat substituted for the article in the book? It does not make any difference to me how it is handled, but I assume that Mr. AMAU wants his notebook back.

THE PRESIDENT: You may make copies, not necessarily a photostat.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Shall I mark it for identification?

MR. SMITH: Will you, please?

THE PRESIDENT: It must be marked now.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 94, identified as Mr. AMAU's book, will receive exhibit No. 1248 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No.1248 for identification only.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past nine tomorrow morning.